The Reconstructionist

Vol. XIII. October 31, 1947 Heshvan 17, 5708 No. 13

- *WORLD UNION FOR JEWISH EDUCATION*

  by Alexander M. Dushkin

- *THE PHILOSOPHY OF FRANZ ROSENZWEIG AND THAT OF RECONSTRUCTIONISM*

  by Leo Trepp

- *RANDOM THOUGHTS*

  by M. M. K.

- *CORRESPONDENCE*

ticated to the advancement of Judaism as a religious civilization, to the upbuilding of el's ancient homeland, and to the furtherance of universal freedom, justice and peace.

the Reconstructionist

is published bi-weekly for twenty consecutive issues, starting in October, by the Jewish Reconstructionist Foundation, Inc., 15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y. Subscription $2.00 per year; 10c per copy; foreign 25c extra; membership in the Foundationn, $5.00 per year, including subscription to *The Reconstructionist*. Reentered as second class matter October 3, 1935, at the Post Office at New York, N. Y., under the Act of March 3, 1879.

EDITORIAL BOARD:
Chairman: **Mordecai M. Kaplan**
Associate Chairman: **Ira Eisenstein**
Managing Editor: **Eugene Kohn**

Associate Editors: **Israel S. Chipkin, Judith K. Eisenstein, Theodore Friedman, Roland B. Gittelsohn, Jacob S. Golub, Emanuel Green, Bernard Heller, Will Herberg, Aharon Kessler, Edward T. Sandrow, Judah Shapiro, Milton Steinberg, Bernard Weinryb, Max Wiener.**

Contributing Editors: **Morris Adler, Michael Alper, Nathan A. Barack, Morton M. Berman, Philip S. Bernstein, Asher Block, Samuel M. Blumenfield, Ben-Zion Bokser, William J. Boxerman, Jack J. Cohen, Mortimer J. Cohen, Lawrence W. Crohn, Samuel Dinin, Harry Essrig, Emanuel Gamoran, Judah I. Goldin Solomon Goldman, Robert Gordis, Samuel G. Kohs, Milton Konvitz, Myer S. Kripke, Louis M. Levitsky Theodore N. Lewis, Joshua Loth Liebman, Sidney Morgenbesser, Maurice Pekarsky, David Polish, Joshua Trachtenberg, Leo Trepp, Max Weine, Jacob J. Weinstein.**

Executive Secretary: **Hannah L. Goldberg**

AMONG OUR CONTRIBUTORS

ALEXANDER M. DUSHKIN is executive vice-president of the Jewish Education Committee of New York and served as associate professor of education at the Hebrew University, Jerusalem during the spring term, 1947.

LEO TREPP is rabbi of Temple Sinai, Tacoma, Washington, and a contributing editor to THE RECONSTRUCTIONIST.

All books reviewed in *The Reconstructionist* and other books of interest may be obtained from the Reconstructionist Book Department, 15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y.

READY NOW!

THE MEANING OF GOD IN MODERN JEWISH RELIGION

By MORDECAI M. KAPLAN

This significant work interpreting the Sabbath, the Holydays and the Festivals in terms of modern thought and experience has been reprinted by popular request.

381 pages with index $3.00 per copy

A study syllabus entitled

JEWISH RELIGIOUS BELIEF FOR TODAY

is available for use with this book.

Fifty cents per copy.

JEWISH RECONSTRUCTIONIST FOUNDATION, Inc.,
15 West 86th Street, New York 24, N. Y.

Please send me ..... copies of THE MEANING OF GOD IN MODERN JEWISH RELIGION.

Please send me ..... copies of the syllabus JEWISH RELIGIOUS BELIEF FOR TODAY.

Check for $..... is enclosed.

NAME .....

ADDRESS .....

The Reconstructionist

Vol. XIII. October 31, 1947 Heshvan 17, 5708 No. 13

EDITORIALS

OCCASION FOR GRATITUDE, NOT FOR RELAXATION

AMERICAN and Russian support in the United Nations of the principles of the majority report of the U.N. Special Committee on Palestine affords the greatest encouragement to the Jewish people that it has received for many a year. We are profoundly grateful to our Government for having put the weight of its influence, an influence that may well be decisive, on the scale of partition, which means a Jewish state in Eretz Yisrael. We are profoundly grateful to Russia for having relieved us of the anxiety that the many points in controversy between her and the United States would influence her against a solution that our Government favored. Her support should give the quietus to the libel that Zionism is a capitalist scheme of imperialist exploitation. We are grateful to all the other nations whose insight, sympathy and vision led them to speak up for Jewish statehood.

But our gratitude goes further. When we reflect on how near the Jewish people came to being utterly destroyed as a collective entity, how one-third of our population was slain, another third forced to live precariously in lands where they are not wanted, and how the remainder were rendered impotent to save them by the heartless rules and regulations of dehumanized departments of state, the turn that events have taken seems little short of a miracle. Indeed, it is a vindication of our faith in God, for our victory will be secured not by our might nor by our power, but by the recognition of the righteousness of our cause and of the indomitable spirit manifest in our constructive achievements in Eretz Yisrael. As long as our cause was dependent on the more or less secret working of foreign offices carrying out selfish nationalist policies, we were driven almost to despair, but when it was brought into the open and publicly aired before the bar of judgment of mankind, it was accorded its first significant recognition since the issuance of the Mandate. If by *miracle* we mean, not necessarily a divine intervention suspending the operation of natural law, but a manifestation in human events of a Power that gives ultimate victory to the cause of justice and freedom, we can indeed thank God in the present juncture for the miracle He has performed in our behalf and pray that it may be an augury of United Nations success in finding a just solution for the other problems that trouble our war-weary world.

Our gratitude to God must not, however, be accompanied by a relaxation of our Zionist efforts. Sinister forces are still arrayed against us and great tasks still

need to be done before the Jewish state becomes a reality. This is not a time for Zionist demobilization.

In the first place, although the preponderant majority of the United Nations favors the principle of the partition of Palestine into an Arab and a Jewish state, the adoption of the plan requires an affirmative vote of two-thirds of the states represented in U.N. Zionists need, therefore, to urge our Government to make every necessary effort to persuade doubtful delegations to vote for the proposal. Strong representations must also be made by Zionists to modify the partition plan so as to include Western Galilee and the new section of Jerusalem in the Jewish state. And then, should all these efforts be successful, we would still be confronted with the problem of implementation. Neither the American nor the Russian proposal is clear on that point. Can we rely on British forces to implement partition when Great Britain is opposed to it and has announced her unwillingness to do so? Can we depend on an international constabulary, which the American proposal envisages? How would such a constabulary be recruited? Who would command it? What assurance would there be of its loyalty? These and many more political problems still remain to be solved. A mere recognition of our right to statehood will not give us a state. We have still to make sure that our right will be backed by adequate international sanctions.

Moreover, even should the political problem be solved to our satisfaction, the Zionist organization would still have tremendous tasks immediately before it. There will be grave economic problems. The creation of a mass immigration movement calls for large-scale economic enterprises, and the whole of Jewry will have to be drawn upon to insure the success of those efforts. That should be a glorious enterprise undertaken with joy, but it will involve work as well.

We are grateful for the miracle that has happened to us. But our fathers, in an age which never questioned the miracles recorded by tradition, declared, "One must not depend on a miracle." Miracles are performed by faith and faith calls for action. Until the final victory, we may not relax our efforts. Our Zionist leaders have shown wisdom and zeal in the service of their people and we must rally to the support of their efforts with all the resources at our command.

IN ANTICIPATION OF STATEHOOD

NOW that the dream of a Jewish state in Eretz Yisrael is nearing realization, the time has arrived for giving earnest thought to the constitutional foundations of the new state. Statehood by itself is not an absolute good. Rather is it an opportunity, the value of which depends on how we use it. But the structure of the state and its fundamental law will necessarily condition the vital uses that it is designed to serve. Though there is still political work to be done toward the achievement of statehood, we can no longer defer the discussion of the character of the state we wish to see established.*

To be sure, many of the features of the Jewish state have been predetermined by the course that the Zionist movement has already taken. It is virtually inconceivable that the general form of the state shall be other than that of a republic embodying a high degree of social democracy. But the concrete application of the prin-

* As we go to press, we learn that the Vaad Leumi has taken cognizance of the need for beginning work on the constitution and has appointed a legal staff headed by Zerach Wahrhaftig to make the preliminary studies.

ciples of social democracy to the specific conditions of life in Eretz Yisrael calls for much immediate thought.

We do not propose to discuss in detail in this editorial any of the important problems with which a constitutional convention will—we hope in the near future—have to grapple. We want only to indicate what some of them are, to evoke discussion on the subject, and to make a few suggestions as to procedure in the drafting of the new state's constitution.

ONE of the simplest questions which will confront the constitutional convention will be the choice of a name for the Jewish state. The name *Palestine* will not be satisfactory, since, as a geographical term it has been applied to the whole area that includes the two projected states west of the Jordan, the Jewish and the Arab, and Transjordania. Moreover, the land has never been known as Palestine in Jewish tradition and is not so designated in current Hebrew usage. Our proposal for an appropriate name would be *Eretz Yisrael*. This has the sanction of Jewish usage, past and present, in the whole of Hebrew literature and in current Hebrew speech.

A much more difficult problem will be the secularization of the Jewish civil law and the assurance to all citizens of full religious freedom. At the present time, the Orthodox rabbinate (and there is no other rabbinate in Eretz Yisrael) is the sole authority for the administration of Jewish law in matters of marriage, divorce and inheritance. The result is that un-Orthodox elements cannot effect any necessary changes, such, for example, as would give women equal status in law with men. Other aspects of civil law are today administered by courts set up by the government, which applies a code based partly on Turkish, partly on British law. But fanatical Orthodox elements in the Yishuv will now want all Jewish courts to administer Talmudic law, although that law was designed for the government of an exclusively Jewish community. Moreover, that law is based on the assumption that it has been revealed by God and is not subject to legislative amendment. Its application would therefore violate the democratic principle of government by the people.

Even if we should wish to submit the administration of Jewish law exclusively to rabbinic authorities—and most of the Yishuv would certainly not—the United Nations, which must approve the constitution, would surely not give its assent to such a provision in a state that would include Moslems and Christians as well as Jews. It would insist on the principle of the separation of Church and State. But just how that separation can be affected needs careful study. We do not, on the one hand, want to discard completely the Jewish legal tradition, nor, on the other hand, to interfere with the religious freedom of Jewish non-conformists and of non-Jews.

Neither does the principle of the separation of Church and State automatically resolve the conflict of religious and social ideals in another field than that of law, in the field of education. No modern state can forego responsibility for educating its citizens in public schools. In a Jewish state, it is inconceivable that every political, social and religious ideology shall have a completely autonomous system of education, which is nearly the case in the Yishuv at the present time. The problem is how to educate the entire population, non-Jewish as well as Jewish, for common cooperative citizenship, and at the same time to respect the rights of parents to educate their children in accordance with their own religious ideals, cultural traditions and social and political convictions. We have not solved the problem in the United

States and we cannot expect a facile solution of it in Eretz Yisrael.

In an entirely different area, that of economic life, the attainment of statehood will also involve a change from present practice. Until now, the need for providing for enlarged Jewish immigration and increasing the economic absorptive capacity of the country justified the exclusive employment of Jews on projects financed by Jewish public funds. No labor immigration was possible without insuring the immigrant a job. The employment of Arabs by Jewish capital would have limited Jewish immigration and exposed us to the charge of capitalist exploitation and economic parasitism. But with immigration policy in the hands of a Jewish state and with public funds derived from taxation, there would be no justification for such discrimination. Provision against economic discrimination on racial, religious or political grounds will have to be included in the constitution of the Jewish state.

THESE are a few of the many problems involved in drafting the constitution of the new state. Who shall do the drafting? We suggest that the Jewish Agency call into being for this purpose a special commission of experts representing Diaspora Jewry as well as the Yishuv. The inclusion of Jews from the Diaspora is desirable, even though they will not be citizens of the new state, because the status of Jewry everywhere will be affected by the kind of life that will develop in the Jewish state and because all of world Jewry has helped to attain statehood for Eretz Yisrael Jews. Of course, the final adoption, with whatever amendments may suggest themselves, will have to be left to a constitutional convention representing the population of the projected state, including the non-Jewish minority, and will be subject to U.N. ratification. We would recommend, further, that the drafting commission consult leading authorities in the social and political sciences, Gentiles as well as Jews. It should, moreover, make a careful study of other constitutions and embody their best features in its draft. No pains should be spared in making the legal foundations of the new Jewish state strong, stable, and adapted to the needs of the people.

THE ETHICS OF PUBLIC OPINION POLLS

HAVE those who publicize the findings of public opinion polls any moral responsibility for the consequences of their publicity? This question is raised with particular pertinency by the latest *Fortune* survey conducted by Elmo Roper and reported in the October 1947 issue of that journal.

According to the account published in the magazine, Mr. Roper's organization recently carried through a systematic investigation of racial and religious intolerance in the United States. Using a secret-ballot method, the investigators asked a number of questions of which the following are the first two:

Question: Do you think any of these groups (Catholic, Protestants, Jews, Negroes) are getting more economic power anywhere in the United States than is good for the country?

Question: Do you think any of these groups are getting more political power anywhere in the United States than is good for the country?

In both cases, those who gave an affirmative answer placed the Jews very noticeably at the head of the list. From which Mr. Roper draws the conclusion that "the Jews stand out as chief object of United States racial and religious dislike. . . . Seventy-three percent of those

who had any hostility to express along economic lines and fifty-two percent of those who had any hostility to express along political lines picked on the Jews."

That anti-Semitism is widespread among large sections of the American people is hardly news. To that extent, Mr. Roper's poll confirms the general impression. But what shall we say of the questions Mr. Roper has chosen to reveal the state of the public mind? Could any more obvious leading question be devised than to ask whether specifically named minority groups are getting more economic and political power than is good for the country? Is it not obvious that questions such as these invite their own answer—an answer of rather sinister implications?

The very categories in which the whole inquiry was framed seem to us to be repugnant to the democratic idea to which America is committed. What does it mean for a racial or religious group to possess economic or political power in a country such as ours? Did the Jews of New York possess any more power when Herbert H. Lehman was governor than when Alfred E. Smith was chief executive, Does the mass of American Jews acquire any particular economic potency just because some Jewish banker or industrialist happens to outstrip his non-Jewish rivals? Like questions are, of course, pertinent to the other minority groups mentioned. The whole concept is too suggestive of the "Papal conspiracy" or the "Elders of Zion" psychology to be quite acceptable as a technique of responsible public opinion probing.

We do not for a moment question the good will or honest intentions of either Mr. Roper or *Fortune* magazine. We merely want to indicate that questions such as Mr. Roper has devised are only too likely to elicit certain specific types of response and thus to encourage dangerously undemocratic stereotypes of behavior among the American people.

This brings us to the larger issue. Improperly framed questions are defects in technique with social implications that go far beyond the technical. But even apart from objections of this kind, there is the more basic question as to the moral responsibility involved in the entire procedure. It seems to us that with public opinion surveys having become so popular an institution in this country, some serious thought ought to be given to this more basic question.

Public opinion polls claim to reveal the state of the public mind on important issues, and when properly conducted they presumably do. But, when given wide publicity, do they not also *influence* the public mind? When people read reports on what America thinks on this or that, do not these very reports become a factor in molding the thinking of Americans? And if so, if reports of public opinion surveys are not merely passive registers of mass sentiment but dynamic factors in determining action, do not those who sponsor and publicize them bear a definite moral responsibility for the consequences?

No amount of publicity about the state of the heavenly bodies can possibly change the outcome of their motions, but every politician knows that a report on how the people of the nation feel about presidential candidates may very well have a decisive effect on the outcome of the election. In such cases, the publicizing of a public opinion survey is quite definitely an instrument of political propaganda and is subject to those criteria of judgment that apply to propaganda in general.

We are ready to grant—indeed, we insist—that scholars and scientists should pursue their inquiries uninfluenced by considerations of possible consequences; otherwise free inquiry as such would be altogether impossible. But the case is surely

different for those who utilize the findings of science to influence the thinking and feeling of masses of people. Are they not under the same moral obligation to take into consideration the consequences of their acts as is anyone else who participates in the active life of society? Admittedly, the line is often hard to draw, but the principle is clear enough. And it is equally clear that surveys of public opinion published in journals such as *Fortune* fall into the latter category. Freedom of the press is, under the American system, a sacred and inviolable right; all the more reason, therefore, it seems to us, for those who possess it to exercise it in a scrupulous and responsible manner. A newspaper running a story with the headline, "Americans Believe Jews Have Too Much Power," would be severely criticized, to say the least. Is the case so very different with a magazine featuring a public opinion poll saying the same thing? We do not have any final answer to this question, but we do believe that the question itself deserves some pretty serious consideration.

REALITIES AND VALUES

SUPPOSE THAT EDUCATION IN America were not compulsory. Suppose moreover, that the schools were not supported by the government but were almost wholly dependent on tuition fees paid by parents and on communal funds given voluntarily. What percentage of children do you think would be getting an education? Certainly not a very high one, if we are to judge by the neglect of our local governments to provide sufficient school buildings and teachers for our children even under present circumstances.

But in Eretz Yisrael, where there is no compulsory education law, and the funds spent on education by the government are very meagre and are spent almost exclusively on the Arab community, 91 percent of Jewish children of school age are enrolled in the schools of the Yishuv.

▼

NOW THAT ERETZ YISRAEL stands on the threshold of statehood, many a young American Jew would probably welcome an opportunity for a career in the service of the new state. Well, here is an opportunity for a limited number of them.

For the last two years the Jewish Agency has been conducting a Jewish Public Service College. At its opening 25 out of 600 candidates from the Yishuv were admitted. The Jewish Agency office in New York has now announced that the school is prepared to admit between ten and fifteen candidates from the Diaspora.

Candidates who possess the following qualifications have a chance of being admitted. They must be between 22 and 28 years of age, preferably university graduates and unmarried, and must have a good working knowledge of Hebrew. The course lasts 18 months and costs $120 a month, including living expenses.

▼

WE HAVE NOT UNTIL NOW been very profoundly impressed by assertions made by Germans that the German people have, in any considerable degree, repented of their wholesale murder of Jews. We have waited to see evidence in action of a desire to make amends to the survivors.

At last we have some such evidence. J.T.A. News reports that the cabinet of the German state of Hesse in the American zone has voted unanimously to donate the sum of $2,500 for the relief of the Exodus refugees. The action followed an appeal by the *Wiesbadener Kurier,* a newspaper published in Hesse, which offered to match all contributions sent in. Up to the date of the despatch, October

14, $3,400 had been received from its readers.

Can it be that the re-education of the Germans has been more effective than we imagined?

▼

AMERICAN FREE ENTERPRISE IS very much lauded these days in the press. But in one field, at any rate, free enterprise in America seems to have fallen down—in the field of voluntary support of religious, educational and character-building institutions.

This is the alarming situation as presented by the National Stewardship Institute of the Golden Rule Foundation: that, though our national income "in cost of living dollars" has more than doubled, our per capita gifts for all church and church-related charity last year were 38 percent less than they were during the depression years of 1931-32, and less than they were a quarter of a century ago.

To remedy this situation, the National Stewardship Institute, under the direction of its chairman, Dr. Allen E. Claxton, has scheduled a national conference to be held in Washington, D. C., on November 18-19, with the purpose of creating an inter-faith and inter-agency movement that will lift the whole standard of stewardship.

▼

WITH ANTI-JEWISH DISCRIMINATION limiting the economic opportunities of our young people, it becomes a major duty of the Jewish community to help find employment for Jews where good opportunities exist.

An attempt to fulfill this duty is being made by the Jewish Occupational Council, the national association of Jewish Vocational Services agencies.

It has adopted a plan whereby its 19 constituent agencies in the United States and Canada will keep each other informed of the availability of jobs in their respective communities which cannot be filled by local residents and for which employers are willing to consider persons from another community.

▼

IT IS INTERESTING TO NOTE how two people can react to similar situations in diametrically opposite ways. Our attention was recently called to two instances of men reacting to experiences of racial discrimination. One of them was the case of a Gentile, who being taken

(*Continued on Page* 21)

We mourn the death of the world's conscience.

It gasped for breath in the smelly holds of three British ships enroute from Haifa, and died on the docks of Hamburg beneath the blows of truncheons wielded by the soldiers of a Socialist state.

We mourn its passing, noting with horror that no nation of the world rose to its defense.

Courtesy of Furrows

World Union for Jewish Education

By ALEXANDER M. DUSHKIN

THE World Conference on Jewish Education, held in Jerusalem during the summer, was as significant as it was courageous and dramatic. Its courage and drama were strikingly clear; its significance needs to be interpreted. As one of the organizers of the Conference (together with Professors Roth and Rieger of the Hebrew University and Dr. Nathan Morris, of England), I am glad to avail myself of the invitation of *The Reconstructionist* to interpret the spirit and meaning of the Conference as understood by some of us who participated in it.

The Significance of Holding the Conference in Eretz Yisrael

The very fact that the Conference was held in these days was in itself an act of faith of great value. But the Conference was more than merely a courageous, dramatic gesture. We believe that it marked the sad end of an important era in our history, that of Eastern European hegemony in Jewish cultural life, and the beginning of what must now be the new era in Jewish education, in which the Yishuv of Palestine and the Jewish community of America must together cooperate to play the central roles.

Again we were given proof of the spiritual energy of the Yishuv. Engaged as it is during these difficult times in so many vital struggles on so many fronts, the Yishuv nevertheless found sufficient energy to bid at this very time for leadership in our common endeavor to teach Torah to our children, in our common struggle against Jewish ignorance and self-depreciation. Perhaps the chief significance of the Conference lies in the fact that the Yishuv has thus begun to play consciously its central spiritual role in the Jewish world. For the first time after so many centuries, the *Word,* however muffled and uncertain, has again begun to come from Jerusalem.

There was drama in the call issued by the Hebrew University (in conjunction with Vaad Leumi, the teachers of Eretz Yisrael and others) to Jewish educators throughout the world to come to Mt. Scopus for the consideration of Jewish education as a world problem. There was drama too in the response. In spite of the difficulties of travel, in spite of real and imaginary dangers of life in Palestine during days of cruel barbed wire, jittery curfew atmosphere, and demoralizing terror, almost 150 educators came from 24 lands. They came all the way from India and Australia, from Canada and Chile, from France, Holland, Great Britain, from Eastern and Middle Europe, from North and South Africa. We are proud to record the decisive role played by American Jewry; for in the days of indecision when some leaders even in Eretz Yisrael thought the project foolhardy, it was the American Jewish educators who made the dream a reality when they declared that over sixty delegates were ready to come from the U.S.A. The dignified academic exercises in the amphitheatre of the Hebrew University, which opened the Conference on the afternoon of July 29, with the setting sun reflected against the opalescent mountains of Moab, gave a glorious setting to the drama of Jewish education returning to Zion for *the Word.*

The General Resolutions

To be sure, there were no prophets at this conference. This first world gathering was rather in the nature of a *kibbutz*

galuyot longing for *Shekhinah;* a scattered group of somewhat confused people coming together to express their unified desire for some guiding, fructifying words in Jewish education. On the surface, the Conference was like any other such gathering; including the usual wordy discussions, over-heated debates and high-sounding resolutions. The Conference by no means "tried to impose from without a uniform program of education on Diaspora Jewry." It was clearly recognized that it would be futile and foolish to attempt to draw up a charter or a constitution for the conduct of Jewish education throughout the world. It was natural, however, that the delegates, even at this first Conference, should attempt to express their own desiderata in Jewish education; without pretending that these are either directives or immutable principles. The resolutions, like all such resolutions, were passed in the heat of debate and many of them with small majorities. Thus, for example, the important question of whether the Hebrew term corresponding to Diaspora should be *Tfutzot* or *Tfutzot Hagolah* was decided by a majority of four votes (most of the American delegation present, incidentally, voting for the *latter*); so that a change of two opinions would have taken the Diaspora out of Exile! Too bad that so few of the American Jewish educators who are not *Sholele Hagalut* should have found it possible to come to the Conference; their presence would certainly have changed the phraseology of most of the resolutions.

It is not in the particular wording of the resolutions, however, that the significance of the Conference is to be found. Nor did the debates and discussions convey the full import of what was taking place. The issues were not new. The most spirited and warm debates were in the realm of aims, particularly on the question of *hityashvut*: — to what degree personal settlement in Eretz Yisrael is to be the primary aim of Jewish education in the Diaspora. As was to be expected, there was a lively disagreement on this issue, expressive of the difference of emphasis between the East and the West. The educators from all the lands of the European continent presented with overpowering intensity their own immediate need and desire for personal settlement in Eretz Yisrael as the dominant, nay the only, motive for Jewish education. The educators from Western Europe, particularly Britain, and from America, laid greater stress on education for life in the local Jewish communities, with frequent pilgrimages to Eretz Yisrael as part of that education. *Halutziut* and personal settlement, they claimed, can be the educational aim only for those who have first been taught the desire for the fullness of Jewish life and for the opportunity to share in the upbuilding of the Homeland. These, they argued, can only be end products in Jewish education and in Jewish living. Therefore appeals for *Halutziut* from western lands must be based on approaches different from those which were effective in Eastern Europe; they must be directed first to creating the desire for Jewish life and knowledge. It was difficult for the delegates, not only from the broken communities of Europe but from the other lands as well, to understand those who argued that America must not be conceived of as "exile," and that *hityashvut* can not be the only or even the primary aim of American Jewish education. It was important, however, that this position be stated on a world platform, to be repeated again and again during the coming years.

Likewise there was considerable warmth in the discussion of the place of "religion" in Jewish education. Many of the western educators insisted that everything which is taught to Jewish children in the Diaspora

—Hebrew, History, Bible, Rabbinic and Modern Literature, Customs and Laws, Prayers, Palestine, Song and Art Forms—all must be regarded as religious teaching, though not necessarily Orthodox teaching. The educators of Eretz Yisrael, and many of the Europeans as well, argued for an "all or nothing" conception of religious education; either *Hinukh Dati* as Orthodox education, or education in Jewish culture and civilization in a nationalist secular framework. Our contention that religious education can be *either* Orthodox or non-Orthodox, they consider trivial and superficial. For evidently to them *dat* is codified religious law, as interpreted in life by the rabbinate, and particularly by the Chief Rabbinate in Eretz Yisrael. No other religious ideology has as yet made itself felt in the life of the Yishuv, or in most of the communities of the Diaspora.

The resolutions adopted by the Conference which related to these questions were necessarily general — that "Jewish education is to be Zionist and Hebraic, in the spirit of Torah and of Jewish Tradition. Such education is to prepare the individual Jew to share in the life and activities of his local community. But it is also to develop in him the desire for Jewish living to the point of wishing full personal identification with the fullness of creative Jewish life in Palestine." Doubtless these and similar questions will form the materials for discussion and clarification in many of the future conferences, which are to be held once every three to five years.

The Abiding Significance of the Conference

Those of us who were listening for the overtones of the Conference, for its abiding significance, felt that out of the discussions and resolutions, and above their trite phraseology, some very important though simple, guiding words were indeed spoken; not as mandates but as indications of the desired direction in Jewish education. These simple words were given special importance, nay a certain sanctity, by the occasion and the place:

1—Jewish education is one the world over, and its problems are basically common to all lands of the Diaspora despite environmental differences. No single group or community, whether large or small, important or unimportant, should or can isolate itself from other groups and communities in the common task of teaching Jewish life and culture to our children. In this increasingly inter-dependent and inter-communicating world of ours, Jewish educators must organize themselves into a World Union for mutual understanding and aid.

2—In the post-war world family of Jews there are two Big Brothers, so to speak, the Yishuv in Eretz Yisrael and the Jewish community in America. Upon these two devolves the duty of implementing the idea of world union into a practical program of educational inter-communication and of help, particularly to the less fortunate Jewish communities. The position of the Yishuv must be central; its contribution is to be in Hebraic content, in new life forms and in a renewed faith in the vitality of Judaism in the modern world, resulting from the dynamics of Jewish life in Eretz Yisrael. The contribution of America as the greatest center of the Diaspora, is to come mainly in social approaches and pedagogic means, in the methodology and practice of Jewish education; for its problems are more closely akin to those of the other Diaspora communities than are the problems of the Yishuv.

The World Union for Jewish Education in the Diaspora, organized at the Conference, is therefore to have its central seat in Jerusalem (with Dr. Eliezer Rieger of the Hebrew University as its

President), and is to have a subsidiary office in New York. The over-all purposes of the World Union are to channelize the contributions of both the Yishuv and the Diaspora, to work for the cross-fertilization of educational ideas and practices, and for the stimulation and improvement of Jewish education everywhere, particularly in the Jewishly weaker communities of the world. The Union is to be governed by a Council of 90 representatives from the various lands (24 Americans) and by an Executive Board of 21 members.

3—Between the Homeland in Eretz Yisrael and the communities in the Diaspora, cultural bridges are to be erected. Among the most important are those to be achieved through the continuous interchange of students and teachers. The World Union is to concern itself with stimulating and directing young people to come to Eretz Yisrael for study at the Hebrew University and in other Palestinian institutions and for participating in the life of the Yishuv, either as *ole regel,* visitors and pilgrims, or as those bringing a specific contribution to *binyan haaretz* in skill and knowledge, or as permanent settlers. In the reverse direction of this two-way passage, the World Union is to help place the sons and daughters of the Yishuv who go abroad for specialized study, so that these can be of the greatest use in the Jewish life of the communities in which they temporarily abide. Another concern of the Union is stimulating the exchange of teachers and professors in secondary and higher schools; as is also the setting up of a *Jerusalem Examination in Hebrew,* to be given in all non-Hebrew-speaking countries as a standardizing educational instrument, after the pattern of the Cambridge Examination in English now given in non-English-speaking countries.

4—As for the content and spirit of Jewish education, the Conference expressed itself naturally for a *maximum* of Zionist Hebraic education, to be given in fully integrated modern bi-lingual all-day schools. Where the all-day school is not possible or feasible, the desideratum should be some other intensive Hebraic school, such as the daily Talmud Torah. It was abundantly clear to those present that other forms of Jewish education, a great variety of them, may have to be used by communities and institutions in the Diaspora. The spirit of the Conference, however, was that these should not be defended as educational ideals, but rather as compromises which may be necessary in particular places and for particular reasons. Any person or organization that believes in intensive Zionist Hebraic education as the desideratum, may join the World Union, whatever other forms of educational endeavor he (or it) may find necessary to engage in.

The Challenge to Diaspora Jewry

That the aims of the Conference are far from reality in Diaspora practice was quite well known to the participants. While they were glad to learn of the developments in the all-day schools in the U.S.A. and in the Hebraic summer camp movement, it did not require much acumen for them to realize that there are many social and psychic factors which make these educational programs difficult to achieve in the Diaspora; almost to the point of despair. But it is exactly at this point that the World Union under the leadership of the Yishuv may have its greatest contribution to make, namely in reinspiring the Diaspora with some of its own spirit of "nevertheless," of *af al pi ken — v'lamrot ha-kol.*

We all marvel at the remarkable courage of the Yishuv, at the "nevertheless" attitude which has enabled it to achieve so much against such great odds, physi-

cally and spiritually. Some of us who have been privileged to come into close contact with the Yishuv, feel that its spirit of daring and stubbornness stems from the deepest roots of Jewish religious tradition and expresses its loftiest aims, namely to make the *Ought* supreme in the world, to make life what it *ought* to be; somewhat in the biblical spirit of *Ehyeh Asher Ehyeh* — I shall be what I should be. It is a moving vindication of our entire Zionist struggle that when our people returned to the homeland of that religious tradition of the *Ought,* it should have been impelled to express it in ways that are so manifold and so dramatic.

We in the Diaspora stand in need of rededication to our religious ethical tradition of making life what it *ought* to be. In this regard, all of us can say *Al Het.* We have succumbed too quickly to the difficulties of environment. Hebrew teachers have too quickly succumbed to the parents' desire for *Ivri*; Conservative rabbis, and even Orthodox, have too quickly succumbed to the Sunday school; Jewish educators have too quickly succumbed to the pressure for "easier and cheaper" forms of education, without gaining either this world or the next, either more pupils or more knowledge. Naturally, we must continue to reckon with our environment and to work in accordance with the social and psychic "realities" in our situation. But the World Union for Jewish Education in the Diaspora, if it is successful, should be of help to us not only through its important practical program but also through a rededication to the spirit of "nevertheless."

The Philosophy of Franz Rosenzweig and That of Reconstructionism

By LEO TREPP

In our preceding issue we published "The Spiritual Biography of Franz Rosenzweig," one of the spiritual leaders of German Jewry between the two wars, who had a profound religious influence on the Jews of Germany. The following article presents some of the principles of his philosophy for American readers and compares them, both in respect to similarities and differences, with the principles of Reconstructionism. In our next issue we shall publish the final article in this series which takes up the Actions Program of Rosenzweig and compares it with that of Reconstructionism.
—*Editors.*

FRANZ Rosenzweig's philosophy has to be understood with reference to the experiences of his life. One of the most decisive of those experiences was the war. It cut into the pattern of his life, forcing him to reckon with the problems of war and peace, as we are compelled to do today. It influenced his thinking about Judaism. After all, *The Star of Redemption* was composed in the very midst of the war.

On War and Peace

Why do wars arise? asks Rosenzweig; and he answers: because of all the peoples in the world, each considers itself a chosen people. Each feels that its ideology, and the principles of its government are the only ones by which the world can recover. Such sentiments may not be exhibited, yet they are constantly at work in the minds of nations and break through at decisive moments. In war, peoples go to the point of staking their very existence on their respective ideologies. In every people there is also a pacifistic trait. This, too, has to be considered in warfare. When the desire for peace reaches such a point that the readiness for sacrifice pales before it,

peace will be made. Warring nations mutually try to reduce the enemy to this state. Then a new contract can be made between nations, a contract by which the defeated nation renounces the idea of being chosen and accepts the principles of the victorious one.

Will such a contract and the experience of war end war? Rosenzweig says, no. Neither can pacifism end wars. Pacifism sees in wars merely a bodily sickness which can be healed if conflict is avoided or people kept apart. This idea is wrong. A man's sickness may be healed through simple remedies. But war changes a man. Just as the experience of friendship tends to make one more friendly, so the experience of war makes one more bellicose. Superficial means of abolishing war, like most of the pacifist programs, will not help.

Once there was peace in the world, says Rosenzweig. It was the peace which existed before war had been tasted. It is the peace which the stones keep with one another, the peace of Paradise. Some day there will be peace again. This peace will come when mankind has completed its course, when the potentialities of war have been eliminated from the souls of men, when mankind will recognize no alternative to peace. This will happen in the time of the Messiah, the time of the Last Kingdom. Meanwhile man will return to war. He must go back to war. As long as nations still enjoy the fullness of their national lives and with it the desire to grow and expand, they face the dilemma between absolute ethical action and national interest. War will exist and the wars at the end of days will not be fought for the purpose of showing mankind how terrible war can be, but to eliminate the wicked entirely.

Only a people which has foregone its natural life, has no home, no living tongue and no future can afford to forget about war. Such a people is the Jewish people. It has no future because it stands at the end of its development, whatever happens to the Jewish people is mere repetition. It has no living tongue only a holy one. It is holy, having paid for holiness with its natural life. The Jewish people by the example of its life and destiny, shows mankind its ultimate goal. We live unto ourselves but for mankind.

This idea seems somewhat removed from Reconstructionist ideology. Reconstructionism wishes to lead us away from our state of abnormal existence, it affirms that the Jew can well live a normal life. It has linked itself to Eretz Yisrael where Jewish history is being made anew.

Yet there are points of agreement between Rosenzweig's analysis and that of Reconstructionism. Rosenzweig's definition of the Jewish people makes it clear that he sees in Judaism a complete self-contained civilization, so strong that it needs no support from without. It is a religious civilization, and we shall see later that in practice though not in theory it is an evolving one.

Jews and Judaism

Religion, according to Rosenzweig, expresses itself in action, not merely in faith and emotion. It is born of experience, grows into philosophy and matures into action and life. Religion raises us beyond the stage of simple vegetating creatures and elevates us to the level of being children of God. It is not ourselves who choose religion, religion chooses us, for no one can help being confronted in his life with a revelation coming from God. But God's call may interfere with our "pursuit of happiness" as mere creatures. Thus people frequently try to escape it, they drug their minds by devoting themselves to the superficialities of life. As soon as we reflect seriously on our lives, we face God. At the same time we recognize our

lives as being unworthy of our human endorsement. The first word which comes to our lips as we face God, therefore, must perforce proclaim this fact. We have sinned.

The answer to God's call is what we call faith. Faith thus stands at the beginning of our journey in this world as God's children. It leads us to deeds. In this manner it puts us on our way to redemption. At the end of the road stands the perfectly good deed. The road of the individual and of mankind leads from compulsion to desire. We have to force ourselves to hear God's call. Once we have heard it, we must force ourselves to act, for faith is not enough. Soon we shall act out of desire, finding that what we do is good for us, and the desire will create a new compulsion, leading us onward. Thus the forces of faith are constantly battling with the forces of life, but always on a higher level. Faith leads to action, action to faith. Thus mankind progresses.

Since the Jewish people, however, has completed its road, all we need is to return, *teshuvah*. The Church leads the people to a repeated *"metanoia"* a change of mind. A constant renewal of faith is necessary for those who are constantly moving towards new goals. The Synagogue calls us to *"teshuvah."* In these two words for repentence the difference between Judaism and Christianity is explained. At the same time, Rosenzweig regards it as an error on the part of the Church to have believed that in faith alone lies salvation.

Reconstructionism may be considered a *teshuvah* movement, calling for the "ardent and strenuous search for God" which actually becomes the equivalent of the demand to love God. We find God as we participate in human affairs, which means through action, and the religious acts which tradition bids us to perform become the symbols of our task. The romantic or mystic God-awareness, namely faith alone, is not enough. Reconstructionism has taken Reform to task for stressing faith at the expense of deeds. Reconstructionism came into existence in opposition to the emotional approach of American Orthodoxy to Judaism, an approach which excludes action and progress within the field of religion and holds on to what is established, because it has always been thus. When Reconstructionism speaks of Jewry as being on the march towards its idealized future, it actually proclaims the idea of *teshuvah,* because a march towards a future which exists *as an idea* means a return to this idea. The rise of various denominations within Chrstianity may be explained in Rosenzweig's terms: they were caused by the need for a new faith. Hence Reconstructionism invites us not to construct such a new faith, or denomination in Judaism, but to reconstruct Judaism in order that faith and action may once again be coordinated.

It is significant that Reconstructionism has no quarrel with the aims of any of our Jewish denominations; neither did Rosenzweig. They all are *teshuvah* movements in the minds of their originators. Rosenzweig and Reconstructionism are one therefore in their demand for a vitalization of Judaism in a way that will bring our lives and our actions into conformity with the living ideas of Judaism and will express those ideas as they need be expressed in our times. At the end of the road, stands Rosenzweig's perfectly good deed; the end of the road for Reconstructionism is "holiness," the state in which the correlation of truth, goodness and beauty finds perfect expression. Our religion must lead us to this state and the appreciation of life's true worth.

The Role of Israel in the Modern World

It can be clearly seen, therefore, that

for Rosenzweig and for Reconstructionism Judaism is not a denomination but one of the great subdivisions of humanity, like Islam and Christianity. Rosenzweig goes further, however. He says: since the Jewish personality, spiritually speaking is a special species of humanity, the Jewish people is of special kind. We are more than a people, as the term is commonly understood, we are more than being one of many similarly fashioned peoples. At the same time, we are less than other peoples, for our particularity forces us to renounce the ambitions and the desires for progress which characterize normal peoples. We have neither land nor language, we are blindfolded, living only to ourselves. Thus the Jewish people is a paradox: because we are more than a people we are less, and because we are less we are more. Merely by being alive we remind the world of the final aim of history towards which it is moving and which we have reached. Desire and compulsion are one. Judaism may be blindfolded as in the symbolic figure on the Strassburg cathedral; its staff may be broken; but in existing it fulfills its task.

Judaism therefore can live by the products of its own spirit. As a matter of fact it has to do so. Other religions, however, are based on it, must be based on it, and must constantly borrow from it. We need not know the others but the others will have to learn from us. Rosenzweig sees an expression of this thought in the words of *Isaiah* (55:5): "Behold thou shalt call a nation which *thou knowest not* and a nation that knew not thee shall *run unto thee*." Israel need not move, because history moves towards it. Judaism in the past did not even think *about* itself, as the non-Jewish world does. When Jews lived in their own confines, they had no philosophy which is thinking *about* Judaism; they thought only *in* Judaism in the form of study, *"lernen."* Only through contact with the outside world was philosophy developed and the need for it appreciated. Study thus became a mode of worship. The fellowship of "learning" parallels the fellowship of the communicants in Christianity. The same applies in the field of action. The pious Jew of the past *desired* to do what the law required him to do. The cycle was closed; there is no progress, only *teshuvah*. Israel is at the end of history; others will follow.

In considering Rosenzweig's ideas, it must be remembered that he speaks of Judaism as an idea. He is far from stating that Judaism as it is today could not or should not be changed. As we live it Judaism is not perfect and certainly Jews are not perfect. Even if the people itself may consider itself different (chosen), the individual Jew definitely is *not* chosen. The fact that Israel has a unique position in the world merely serves to give the individual Jew the will to work for its survival.

In appraising this philosophy and comparing it with Reconstructionism, it should be remembered that Rosenzweig developed it in the course of a controversy with Christianity. In addition, we should be mindful of the fact that the national homeland in Palestine was just a dream at the time of Rosenzweig's youth. He had to find a philosophy which would sustain him without recourse to that dream. Rosenzweig had some difficulty later in squaring himself with Zionism as a growing reality for which he had affection. For that reason we find two basic differences between his philosophy and that of Reconstructionism.

Rosenzweig approaches Judaism theoretically and philosophically, Reconstructionism from a practical angle. Rosenzweig sees the door of the future closed and has to make a virtue out of a deficiency, therefore his idea of an unchangeable Judaism. Reconstructionism sees the

door open. Palestinian Jewry can live its own life following its own inherent laws, and as long as one part of the people can do that, the whole people is made free, for all are bound to be influenced. The only answer Rosenzweig can find therefore must be: God must have willed that our abnormal state should be normal for us. We find the same philosophy in Beer-Hofmann's: "Jacob's Dream." Reconstructionism can speak of the Jewish people as a normal people with a long history and the aspiration for a creative future. The reality of the Jewish homeland puts Reconsrtuctionism at an advantage.

For the Jews in the Diaspora the program of Reconstructionism is very much like Rosenzweig's. In addition there is the contribution of Palestinian Jewry, and Rosenzweig himself has given serious thought to the contribution coming from Zion. Because of this different outlook and because it is an American philosophy, Reconstructionism lays emphasis on participation in general civilization on the part of the Jew He is helped by it in his Jewish life. The German Jew could not make this request a part of a religious philosophy since his status was not secure enough. A philosophy, after all, deals with abiding values. This participation becomes easier for the Zionist who is in no danger of losing himself, a danger which was very real for the liberal Jew in the pre-Zionist era. On the other hand Reconstructionism, based on a healthy national consciousness, is not God-centered as is Rosenzweig's philosophy. In Rosenzweig's philosophy God is the center and the only stabilizing factor in life; Reconstructionism assigns that role to Eretz Yisrael. For Rosenzweig Religion becomes *the* motivation and guiding force, for Reconstructionism it is only one force.

In spite of these differences, however, Rosenzweig's practical ideas on the revival of Judaism are identical with those of Reconstructionism, and will be recognized as identical when we try to state them.

Command and Law

Before the Emancipation, law and command were actually one. Jews desired to do what the law commanded. Now, however, the same process of compulsion leading to desire, which goes on in the world, has to be repeated within the confines of actual, living Jewry. From half-Jews, denominational Jews, Christianized Jews we have to become wholehearted Jews again. This is the cardinal problem for both the Reconstructionists and Rosenzweig. How can it be solved?

The law, as handed down to us, can be of help, says Rosenzweig. It challenges us, not to give blind obedience, but to use it as a basis for self-examination. We have to come to grips with it. Equally, Reconstructionism calls for a revaluation. In revaluating our tradition, we have to remain conscious of the fact that our task is not to preserve the Law but to preserve Judaism. Judaism will not be preserved if we close our eyes to the fact that the process of building in time has to keep pace with the process of time itself. If we refuse to progress, we shall die. A Jew, according to Rosenzweig, may therefore reject a particular law after thorough examination, if he comes to the conclusion that this law does not make him more Jewish. Such a Jew may be better than the one who keeps the law without giving thought to it. The decision is to be made by the individual.

Our present-day generation faces a difficult choice. It may live without the law, but then its life would be Jewishly meaningless. It may live strictly within the confines of the law, but that would require a complete denial of life which the present generation is unable to effect. . . . The *Shulhan Arukh* has proven its vitality, for what greater proof could there be

than the fact that it induced people to sacrifice their lives in obedience to it? But since people would not do that today, all of the *Shulhan Arukh* cannot be said, according to Rosenzweig, to be vital. A total commitment to the Law would be dangerous for the people of our time. It would lead merely to a mechanical observance of the Law and not to an alertness of the soul for God's command. For us there is only one way, namely to grow slowly into an improved Jewish consciousness, moving from experience to experience until our personalities grow back into Judaism.

Like the Reconstructionist movement, Rosenzweig represents a school of thought. He does not outline a program of what to observe and what not to observe but gives direction. Like the Reconstructionists, he evaluates adherence to tradition not solely in terms of group needs, but also in terms of individual spiritual growth and satisfaction, considering the need of the time. From this attitude, stems his criticism of both Orthodoxy and Liberalism which runs along lines similar to Reconstructionism's critique of them.

Orthodoxy, even Samson Raphael Hirsch's Neo-Orthodoxy, is based on the principle of "all or nothing." This is not only arbitrary, according to Rosenzweig; it is also too easy a solution. It is too narrow, leaving out of account the fact that law in Judaism is a historical process. It is too easy, because it demands only that we obey the letter of the law. This would be our only requirement as far as living Jewishly is concerned. Whatever is not forbidden by the law or touched by it, would be permitted. Thus we become split personalities, obeying the law but otherwise living an un-Jewish life, both in thought and in action. Our alternative must be put differently, it cannot be all or nothing, it must be nothing or something. As a matter of fact, this was the program of the 19th century Jewish Liberalism, but Liberalism failed because it isolated itself in the ivory tower of programs and forgot life. It had too many officers mapping out plans, and too few soldiers to carry them out.

Rosenzweig's criticism is based on his analysis of philosophies, both that of Neo-Orthodoxy and of Liberalism; the criticism put forward by Reconstructionism is based on the analysis of life, the lives of those moulded by these philosophies and the forces of life. The end result of both these analyses is the same. It is expressed more strikingly by Reconstructionism which cites examples to be found everywhere on the contemporary scene. Neo-Orthodoxy, as far as the masses are concerned, moved from practical observance to "theoretical" observance, which means lip-service to the law combined with non-observance. This, however, means that "their faith no longer functions in their lives." It has not been able to stem the tide of disintegration. Reconstructionism sees the reason for that in its "rigidity" which may be the same as Rosenzweig's statement, that obedience to the Law rather than a complete immersion in Judaism is the command of Neo-Orthodoxy. A law, constituting the sole foundation of Judaism, has to be rigid. While Rosenzweig is not quite fair to Neo-Orthodoxy as it existed in Germany, his observations are correct as far as actualities are concerned and are borne out by the observations of Reconstructionists in America.

Reconstructionism comes to the same conclusions as does Rosenzweig also in regard to Liberalism. "Reformist theology is irrelevant (in its classical form) because of its failure to realize that religion must express itself in the context of a civilization." (op. cit. p. 14). Reform theology started with its own premise. It conceived its idea of what makes and unites the Jew in the ivory tower of speculation, and in

drawing programs, forgot the Jew as he is. Zionism has forced the nationalist group within Reform to re-think its position in regard to realities, but the criticism of classical Reform is shared by Reconstructionism and Rosenzweig.

The Dynamics of Judaism

Thus we face an extremely difficult task. The growth of the Law is put in our hands. We have to move forward, says Rosenzweig, yet we must not lose touch with the past. It can be done, if we give our body and soul to it. We must press forward while looking backward. We must act here and now. More Rosenzweig is unable to say. If he did, he would establish a new program, his individual program, which would immediately narrow down the task and the result. As it is, he presents an almost impossible challenge to the individual. Reconstructionism has always pressed for action. It has gone further than Rosenzweig. It has moved toward a guide for Jewish usage, it has issued a prayer book, a *Haggadah,* etc. In doing so, it has theoretically accepted the need for giving *concrete* guidance. Immediately it had to face the criticsm that it had advanced an individual program, become a denomination.

Comparing Rosenzweig's idea and the practical experience of Reconstructionism we seem to come to the crux of our present-day Jewish situation. Rosenzweig does not give enough, Reconstructionism gives "too much," as far as the masses are concerned. The solution—if a personal opinion may be stated here—seems to lie in an active cooperation of Reconstructionism wtih Conservatism, whereby Reconstructionism becomes the school of thought and as such may advance quickly and the Conservative group becomes the agency which would guide the practical implementations. Conservatism need not cease to be a school of thought, neither would Reconstructionism have to deny itself the right of advancing practical ideas, but both would go together. Conservatism would go more slowly and yet would move towards an aim.

The importance that Rosenzweig attaches to conscious planning of our life as Jews and self-dedication to Judaism as we understand it can be seen from the following quotation. Speaking of the individual as well as of the group he says:

"Once again the growth of the Law is put in our souls and hands. No one has the right to tell us what belongs to it and what not. Only as it is ourselves (who act) can we give our will its direction. We have no other guarantee that our action, when it comes about, will be Jewish. In any case, however, it is a new law, our present day law, which thus is being established and thus is *the* law. For it was this which we missed and had a right to miss in the law which our modern guardians presented to us: it was the old one, but not new as well. This lack was recognized when by a demarcation line, life of today became one of the "optional" things. In this manner life was denied its present-day actuality. Forgotten was the boldness which made Moses speak to a generation which had never stood at Sinai: 'Not with our fathers did God make this covenant, but with us, these here, today, everyone of us, the living. Confronted with such boldness we have to take our stand. But we do not know the limits. That the tent poles of the Torah have to be moved outward, and by us, that we may consider certain."

Thus Rosenzweig recognizes that once we start moving there may be no halting. But may we not then leave the confines of Judaism? Only the fact that we, Jews, are doing the work for the sake of Judaism gives us the guarantee that this will not result. We now see the seriousness of

the task. It must be undertaken by Jews who live in the full consciousness of being Jews, it must be undertaken with all our souls. The other alternative of merely sticking to the old, he feels would be worse. We cannot retrace our steps, either in thought or in action. Yet, we have to remain in contact with the past.

"There is one special occasion in the life of the spirit," says Rosenzweig, "when it may look backwards without danger and when it may even be good to do so. In all other cases retrospection may become spiritual suicide. How can we distinguish the two? The life of the spirit is so much like a real stream of life that it too throws off dead parts at all times. This is the price for its eternal renascence; every birth is paid for with death. Under certain conditions these dead bodies are carried along for a long time with the stream, only accidentally do they sometimes drift to the shore. Since the stream of the spirit does not have the same speed in all its parts, some waves hurry along whilst others follow slowly. It is therefore good, if those who have rushed ahead stop from time to time, turn backwards and wait for those who have remained behind. This is healthy to establish contact with the whole. This is what we call self-examination for the individual and the spiritual group. But the danger of looking backwards is, that we may fail to see the difference between the dead bodies which are carried along and the slower currents of living matter which are still closer to the source. The consequence then may be that the stream may be clogged up by these dead bodies which are mistaken for living ones; its waters stagnate. It is vitally important for the spirit to distinguish between the dead and the living."

The danger that we may move out of Judaism does not exist for Reconstructionism. Rosenzweig started from without, he did not know where he would finally end up. Reconstructionism started from within and thus will be held within. In addition Reconstructionism finds in Zionism the guarantee that it will not move out of Judaism. Ultimately, according to Rosenzweig, the individual has to make the decision. He can do so only on the basis of knowledge. Thus Rosenzweig developed a plan of education. He analysed the situation, stated the aim of education as he saw it, developed a practical program for youth education, leadership training and adult education. Reconstructionism has followed the same path, stating that Jewish studies must prepare the Jew for the problems that confront him.

REALITIES AND VALUES

(*Continued from Page* 9)

for a Jew, suffered from anti-Jewish discrimination. The other was that of Unitarian minister who had reason to believe that he had Indian blood in his veins and who, though he did not suffer in his own person, was shocked by the unfair discrimination of Whites against members of the colored races.

The former, Dyke Williams Stein, asked permission from a county judge to drop his last name and be known as Dyke Williams.

The latter, the Rev. Kenneth L. Patton, of Madison, Wisconsin, was shocked by the discrimination against Madison Negroesc who wanted to buy or rent homes. He accordingly announced that he would henceforth identify himself "as a man of color."

We are sorry for the Gentile who, without being guilty of the crime of having been born a Jew was penalized as if he had been, merely because of his name.

But we admire the Rev. Kenneth L. Patton. He acted on the standard of values expressed in the saying of the Rabbis: "Better be among the persecuted than among them that persecute."

Random Thoughts

A STANDING joke is the naiveté of our parents who, whenever they were told anything that happened in the world at large, from the most important to the most trivial, would ask whether it was good for the Jews.

For once tables seem to have been turned. What is good for the Jews is being greeted as also good for the Goyim.

Thus in referring to the Soviet Union's endorsement of the United States' stand on the UNSCOP report, the New York *Herald Tribune* pointed out that the endorsement helped to keep alive the hope that at some future time the U.N. will be able to function effectively.

No wonder the Psalmist invokes the Goyim to praise God, because He is good to the Jews, as in the following:

Praise ye the Lord, all ye Goyim,
Laud Him all ye peoples;
For His grace is mighty over us.
(Ps. 117, 1-2).

* * *

Despite some sensational conversions to Catholicism, the truth is that while the roster of honorary membership in the organized religions is growing, the roster of active membership is decreasing.

* * *

That Joshua Liebman's "Peace of Mind" has been on the non-fiction best seller list for so long a time indicates that people are turning elsewhere than to the organized religions for that on which they claim to have a monopoly.

* * *

The trouble with many preachers is that it is difficult to make out whether what they advocate is what they themselves believe, or merely what they want other people to believe.

* * *

For lack of fresh fuel we bank the fire with ashes to keep it burning.

For lack of new ideas we resort to outworn traditions to keep religion from being extinguished.

* * *

To describe a human being as consisting of a body and a soul is like describing milk as a combination of whey and curd.

* * *

Any cause means to a person as much as all he gives to it amounts to when divided by what he *can* give to it.

* * *

Decivilized humans have the viciousness of the uncivilized implemented by the skill and cunning of the civilized.

* * *

Jews who are alienated from Jewish life need Jewish religion as much as a bald-headed man needs a hair brush.

* * *

To expect anti-Semitism to subside if Jews were more ethical than the rest of the population is like expecting a bull to refrain from chasing a vegetarian.

* * *

It is easier to be like our neighbor than to like our neighbor.

It is easier to like ourselves than to be ourselves.

* * *

Professional pride inhibits barbers from using safety razors to shave themselves with. They even boast of not knowing how to handle such vulgar little instruments, and they speak with contempt of

those of their profession who in their own homes resort to safety razors.

Which only goes to show that opposition to change is the occupational disease of any profession.

* * *

The discovery of the irrational and the weird in the human mentality is no reason why we should bring back the belief in witchcraft.

* * *

The advice not to cross a bridge till you get to it is unquestionably sound.

Nevertheless, it is important for anyone who has to map his journey to know ahead of time, when and where there is a bridge to be crossed, and what kind of a bridge it is.

* * *

History is made through the recording of it.

* * *

We are bound to experience disillusion if we take literally the glamorous prophecies of our future, as we are bound to suffer disappointment, if we take literally the glowing description of our past.

* * *

Nazi diabolism has contaminated some of the most helpful and indispensable human values.

Munich has rendered "compromise," untouchable; Vichy has done that to "collaboration."

To permit them to remain untouchable is to refuse to exorcise the evil spirit of Nazism.

* * *

There are three kinds of change possible in human life: evolution, which is slow and haphazard; revolution, which is rapid and destructive; reconstruction, which is deliberate and constructive.

* * *

Human beings have two sets of values: public and personal. The first they profess, the second they practice.

Seldom do those two sets of values coincide.

That is the basic dilemma of human life.

* * *

Meaningless rites remind one of burnt out electric bulbs.

* * *

In the traditional prayer book we thank God that He "has not made us like the nations of the different lands and has not placed us like the other families of the earth."

In our hearts we pray to God that He should make us part of the nations of the different lands and place us like other families of the earth.

That is the Jewish "dilemma."

* * *

Eleanor Roosevelt says we should "demand facts unvarnished by interpretations."

She might as well ask us to convey thoughts "unvarnished" by words.

All language is interpretation.

As long as we have to use language to express facts we inevitably "varnish" them with interpretation.

What we should learn to demand is an honest varnish, one that doesn't make steel look like wood.

* * *

The bafflement and frustration which are a part of every person's life are evidence of the inexhaustible possibilities for good that inhere in the human being.

These possibilities indicate that it is man's destiny to transcend himself.

The drive to self-transcendence is, perhaps, the best means of experiencing the reality of God.

* * *

The main reason for the lag in the human sciences as compared with the physical sciences is that the scientists are only human.

M. M. K.

CORRESPONDENCE

Opposes Zionist Acceptance of UNSCOP Majority Report

Sirs:

Many Zionists have been urging the adoption of UNSCOP's majority report, without reservations. They have either not read or not studied the full text of this report. It is probably because of this mistake of theirs that *Newsweek* of Sept. 22 says on Page 17, "The UN Palestine committee's majority report will have to be trimmed down considerably before the U. S. delegation votes for it."

Formal objections must be filed immediately by the Jewish Agency against all the misrepresentations, of fact and law, in the majority report. This must be done in order to correct the record which future generations may be compelled to rely upon.

The following are a few of UNSCOP's findings to which those Zionists consent who urge the adoption of the majority report:

UNSCOP states that the Zionists have made concessions, which permitted them to re-interpret the Palestine Mandate, that Churchill and the British Government modified the Mandate and the area of Palestine without Zionist objection. (II 84, II 139, II 144, etc.)

UNSCOP found that the Mandate was not "now possible of execution" (V Rec. ld).

UNSCOP failed to correctly interpret the "Memorandum" in reference to the Trans-Jordan area or Article 25 of the Palestine Mandate (II 70) and failed to mention the 1924 Anglo-American Convention. They were strangely silent about the British misconduct in Palestine, which they were appointed to investigate. (I 18 Sub 2).

They said the Weizmann-Feisal agreement was not binding on the Arabs of Palestine because its conditions in reference to other Arab States were not fulfilled by the British. (II 174).

They found that the Arabs produce 75 per cent of Palestine's agricultural products. (II 33). They admitted however, that it was the efforts of Jews that made "the desert blossom as the rose." (II 31, II 151).

They stressed "self-determination," "well-being of the peoples," and "covenant 22" (II 150) for their right to establish a "viable" Arab State in the area of Palestine west of the Jordan. (VI Part II 2), this viable Arab State to be established at the expense of the proposed Jewish State.

They said that the "Jewish State" should help support the Arab State because "a partitioned Arab State would have some difficulty in raising sufficient revenue to keep up its present standards of public services." (VI Part I 12, 13, etc.)

They were concerned with the "creation of two viable states (which they) considered essential to a partition scheme." (VI Part II 2).

They recommended that land restrictions be removed only in the proposed Jewish State (VI Part I B c 2) and guaranteed only *"personal"* property (V Rec. No. 7) rights of the Jews in the Arab State.

They said that Palestine would not solve the Jewish problem and that the DP's were not a Palestine problem.

They said that "The Negev south of Latitude 31, though included in the Jewish State, is desert land of little agricultural value . . ." (VI Part II 5). This is in keeping with the facts and therefore removes the greater portion from the viable Jewish State as being uninhabitable.

They said that the Jewish State must "respect and fulfill all financial obligations of whatever nature assumed on behalf of Palestine by the mandatory power . . . including the rights to pensions, compensations or gratuities, to be negotiated where necessary with the government of the United Kingdom." Also "commercial concessions . . ." (VI Part I Chap. III 3).

They said that the "electoral provisions shall be prescribed" by Britain. That voting shall be on the basis of "proportional representation" (VI Part I B 2, 4 a, etc.) They recommended that Britain continue as the trustee of Palestine during the next two years (VI Part I A), and thereafter until such time as she enables the Jewish State and the Arab State to both reach at the same time a status of statehood entitling them to admission in the UN.

Contrary to the findings and opinions of every impartial authority on international law, they found that Britain had "dual obligations" (II 101) of *"equal weight"* (II 79) to both the Jews and Arabs of Palestine.

They were careful to mention (without exception) each and every Arab message, letter, rumor or Arab fantasy (II 95,—II 159) that the British presented in 1939 to the League, without success, though they admit that it was questionable whether these Arab claims ever applied to the Arabs of Palestine. (II 167-8-9).

They mentioned Churchill's interpretation of the word "in" (II 143) and of the "economic absorptive capacity" for Palestine (II 84).

UNSCOP mentioned the King Crane report (II 148) which Woodrow Wilson rejected when he found it to be false.

Sol A. Dann, Detroit, Mich.